

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 9-10a-b, which have been marked as being "Prior Art". These sheets replace the original sheets including Figs. 9-10a-b.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter in this application.

Applicant would also especially like to thank the Examiner for the time spent in a personal interview with the Applicant's representatives regarding this amendment. Claims 1-5 were discussed in view of the various rejections thereto. No exhibits or demonstrations were shown. As discussed during the interviews, it was agreed to amend the claims as shown herein to overcome the present rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103.

Claims 6 and 7 have been withdrawn as the result of the previous restriction requirement. In view of the restriction requirement, Applicants retain the right to present claims 6 and 7 in a divisional application.

Applicants respectfully requests acknowledgment of the priority claim and confirmation that the priority documents have been received. A certified copy of the priority document was submitted to the USPTO on May 17, 2004.

The Examiner requests to designate Figs. 9 and 10a-b by a legend such as -- Prior Art--. The proposed drawing amendments have been submitted as requested by the Examiner.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains more than 150 words. The abstract has been submitted as requested by the Examiner.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Spencer et al. (US Patent

4,609,801, hereinafter "Spencer"). For at least the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to introduce the limitations from claim 2. Spencer does not describe, teach or suggest each and every limitation as required in the amended claim 1. Specifically, Spencer does not disclose, teach or suggest that a second fold-to-bend portion has a locking hole and a flange portion has a locking projection penetrate through the locking hole as recited in the amended claim 1. Spencer discloses that a flange portion 96c of an inner member 88 has a plurality of equally spaced holes 104c, and a plurality of dimples 106c are pressed into the portion 102 of a front panel flange 96 which overlaps and captures the top panel flange 96c, directly over the spaced holes 104c (column 6, lines 3-8 and Fig. 11 of Spencer). Spencer also discloses a similar crimping connection technique used for flanges 96a and 96b extending along a front edge of side panels 52, 54 as is shown in Fig. 9. (column 6, lines 11-13 of Spencer). In Spencer, the flange 96c has holes 104c and the dimples 106c are pressed into the portion 102 (column 6, lines 3-5 of Spencer).

To the contrary, in amended claim 1, the second fold-to-bend portion has a hole and the flange portion inserted into the clearance between the first fold-to-bend portion and the second fold-to-bend portion has a projection. This structure provides an advantage over that of Spencer. Specifically, during manufacturing, the structure of the instant application provides for a stronger and more reliable coupling. For example, as best seen in Figures 3-4, when press-machining, a through-hole 31 is provided at a side of the press die 37. Therefore, during assembly, it is easy to confirm the position of the locking projection 35 relative to the locking hole 31 because the locking projection 35 is visible through the locking hole 31. Thus, coupling failure due to displacement of the

locking hole 31 and the locking projection 35 is prevented, and reliable coupling is expected.

Conversely, according to the structure shown in Figure 9 of Spencer, a though-hole is formed in the end of the member 54 (corresponding to the flange) and the projection is formed on the member 98b (corresponding to the second-fold-to-bend portion). According to this structure, during assembly the relative position between the projection and the hole cannot be confirmed from the outside. Therefore, accurate positioning cannot be maintained, so that coupling failure may occur.

Thus, Spencer's structures are different from the claimed structure. Moreover, Spencer does not clearly disclose, teach or suggest that the dimples 106b or 106c penetrate through the holes 104b or 104c. Because Spencer does not disclose each and every limitation set forth in amended claim 1, Spencer does not anticipate claim 1.

Claim 2 has been canceled. Claim 3 depends on claim 1, and thus is patentable for at least the same reasons as the parent claim.

Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Spencer in view of Enami (U.S. Patent No. 4,563,559). For at least the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed. The asserted combination of Spencer and Enami does not teach or suggest all of the limitation of claims 4-5.

As mentioned above, Spencer does not teach or suggest each and every limitation as required in claim 1, on which claims 4 and 5 directly or indirectly depend. In particular, as mentioned above, Spencer does not teach or suggest that a second fold-to-bend portion has a locking hole and a flange portion has a locking projection penetrate through the locking hole as recited in the amended claim 1. Enami teaches a joint construction with a front end of a second locking element 321 of a rear panel 308 is

formed with a projection 321A, for example, by punching, and the projection 321A penetrate into the first locking element 332 (column 12, lines 18-24 and Fig. 36 of Enami). However Enami does not teach or suggest that a second fold-to-bend portion has a locking hole and a flange portion has a locking projection penetrate through the locking hole as recited in the amended claim 1. Therefore, Enami fails to make up for the aforementioned Spencer's deficiencies. Thus, the asserted combination of Spencer and Enami, does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1, on which claims 4 and 5 directly or indirectly depend.

Moreover, Enami does not teach or suggest that insulating films are formed on a surface of the front plate on a side opposed to a side of being connected with an inner main body and an outer side surface of the inner main body. In Enami, as shown in Fig. 45, a paint layer 1605 is positioned on all of the front surface of a front panel 605 and a paint layer 1609 is positioned on an inner surface of the top panel 609. Therefore, Enami's painted layer 1605 on the front surface continues all the way to the connected side with the top panel 609. To the contrary, in claims 4 and 5 of the instant application, insulating films are formed on a surface of the front plate on a side opposed to a side of being connected with the inner main body and an outer side surface of the inner main body. In other words, in claims 4 and 5, the insulating film on the front plate and the insulating film on the inner main body are not contacted each other. Consequently, the asserted combination of Spencer and Enami does not render claims 4 and 5 obvious.

Claims 8-12 have been added to claim different aspects of the subject matter described in the application. For example, new claims 10 and 11 describe example embodiments wherein insulating films are formed on the front plate and on the inner main body. An inner peripheral portion of the locking hole is not formed with an

insulating film to thereby constitute a conducted face. Similarly, the projecting surface of the locking projection is a matrix metal face having conductivity. Therefore, the front plate and the inner box main body are electrically connected, and an excellent radio wave shielding effect is achieved. Thus, despite either or both of the front plate and the inner main body having insulating films thereon, which may occur before assembly of the projection with the locking hole, the mechanical connection between the projection and the locking hole also forms an electrical connection therebetween to provide a radio wave shielding effect.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 36548.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: /Bryan M. Gallo/

Bryan M. Gallo, Req. No. 59814

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: July 19, 2007